

Amendment to the Drawings:

Formal drawings are submitted herewith under separate Letter to the Draftsperson as requested by the Examiner. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Formal Drawings

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to for informalities. Formal drawings are hereby presented.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Salam (US 6,081,073). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salam (US 6,081,073) as applied to claims 1-10 above and further in view of Mizoguchi (US 6,028,327). Claim 1 is hereby amended to clarify that the function of producing a signal representing the remaining useful life of the display is provided by means in the controller.

In response to Applicant's previous argument that Salam did not teach a controller that produces a signal representing the remaining useful life of the display, the Examiner declined to take notice of this feature because it was recited as a manner of using a controller. It is now recited as an element of the controller and should therefore be given weight as an element in the claim.

The Examiner also presented the argument that even assuming the feature were to be given weight in the claim, Salam discloses the feature. The Examiner points out that Salam discloses that his system can detect degradation in a lamp and argues that LEDs have a useful life (stated on their package, e.g. 70 hours) and that when compared to the detected degradation, the remaining useful life can be determined. Applicant disagrees with this argument for the following reasons.

It may be that one could predict the remaining useful life of a display from a detected degradation, but Salam does not suggest this and the Examiner has not pointed to any motivation in the prior art for doing it. It must be concluded therefore that the Examiner has reconstructed the prior art in light of Applicant's teaching. It is believed therefore that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art. The remainder of the claims depend from claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reason.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 5, the Examiner argues that the feature of the light emitting diodes, the sensor and the controller being integrated on a common substrate is shown by Salam. A careful look at Fig. 5 of Salam shows that the photosensor and the light emitters are discrete elements mounted on a tile 60, there is


no suggestion that these elements are integrated on a common substrate. The term integrated when referring to circuits has a well known meaning in the electrical arts, meaning the elements are formed on the substrate, not manufactured separately and attached to a circuit board. It is therefore believed that claim 5 is also patentable for this additional reason.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas H. Close
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 27,428

THC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 722-2396
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646

Enclosures: Letter to Draftsperson
Copies of Formal Drawings